

REMARKS:

The examiner required the selection/classification of all previous claims made. The examiner found that those claims comprised thirteen different inventions.

Since so many different inventions were found, the inventor thought it best to re-phrase the claims, so that the novel method was emphasized, and stated as the major elected claim.


Ergo, the inventor re-drafted all claims, emphasizing the novel method, and not the examples provided (which support the method). As such, all previous claims are being cancelled, and new ones provided.

The inventor desired to replace the previous claims 1-14, with the new claims, however, since the logic and text in the new claims is so different from the previous, it was thought best to add the current claims as new. If this can be changed, and the new claims introduced as different versions of the old, a communication along these lines would be appreciated. The inventor was not sure of what, If any charges would apply to this amendment. If any new charges are due, communication along these lines would be also be appreciated.

The claims 37-49 all exist in the prior art. The method in claim 36 does not exist in the prior art; as (at the time of the original filing), the use of blot technology to visualize bound material, along with the optional electrophoresis step (to verify the molecular weight of the bound material), are the novel steps. The use of the known technologies in claims 37-49, in the pursuance of the novel method in claim 36, is what is being claimed. Claim 36 itself makes use of known methods, however it is the sequence of these, and the combination of the known methods/reagents, which make it novel.

The inventor wishes to thank the examiner for the helpful review and hopes that the revised claims make the invention more clear, and easier to examine.

Sincerely,



Philip Cavanovaugh

Inventor

Serial No. 10/002,690

Phone: 313-538-2587

e-mail: pcavanaugh@immed.org

Address: 26215 Ivanhoe

Redford, MI 48239